

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 MICHELLE JULIE RONQUILLO,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00306-MMD-WGC

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER

8 v.

9 NANCY A. BERRYHILL

10 Defendant.

11 Plaintiff Michelle Julie Ronquillo seeks attorney fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §
12 406(b). (ECF No. 25.) Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or
13 “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 26),
14 recommending the motion for attorney fees be granted. Plaintiff had until May 3, 2021 to
15 file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as
16 explained below, the Court adopts the R&R, and will grant the motion for attorney’s fees
17 and award Plaintiff’s counsel \$17,977.50 in fees with an order that Plaintiff’s counsel
18 refund to Plaintiff the \$4,000 for the fees awarded under the Equal Access to Justice Act
19 (“EAJA”).

20 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
21 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
22 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to
23 conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas*
24 *v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
25 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and
26 recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the
27 findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory
28

1 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no
2 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

3 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is
4 satisfied Judge Cobb did not clearly err. Here, Judge Cobb recommends granting the
5 motion for attorney’s fees and awarding Plaintiff’s counsel \$17,977.50 in fees with an
6 order that Plaintiff’s counsel refund to Plaintiff the \$4,000 for the fees awarded under the
7 Equal Access to Justice Act (“EAJA”). (ECF No. 6 at 5-6.) The Court agrees with Judge
8 Cobb. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the R&R
9 in full.

10 It is therefore ordered that Judge Cobb’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No.
11 26) is accepted and adopted in full.

12 It is further ordered that the motion for attorney’s fees (ECF No. 25) in the amount
13 of \$17,977.50 is granted.

14 It is further ordered that Plaintiff’s counsel reimburse Plaintiff the \$4,000 award
15 under the EAJA for the EAJA fees previously paid.

16 DATED THIS 11th Day of May 2021.

17
18 
19 _____
20 MIRANDA M. DU
21 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28